

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
WEST PALM BEACH DIVISION**

CASE NO. 24-81129-CIV-CANNON/McCabe

LONGEVIQUEST, LLC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

WACLAW JAN KROCZEK,

Defendant.

**ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF No. 26]**

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court upon Magistrate Judge Ryan M. McCabe's Report and Recommendation ("the Report"), issued on October 2, 2025 [ECF No. 26]. The Report recommends that Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Attorneys' Fees (the "Motion") be granted in part and denied in part [ECF No. 24]. Objections to the Report were due on October 16, 2025 [ECF No. 26 pp. 7–8]. No party filed objections, and the time to do so has expired [ECF No. 26 p. 8]. Upon review, the Report is **ACCEPTED** [ECF No. 26]; Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Attorneys' Fees [ECF No. 24] is **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART** in accordance with the Report and this Order.

LEGAL STANDARDS

To challenge the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge, a party must file specific written objections identifying the portions of the proposed findings and recommendation to which objection is made. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *Heath v. Jones*, 863 F.2d 815, 822 (11th Cir. 1989); *Macort v. Prem, Inc.*, 208 F. App'x 781, 784 (11th Cir. 2006). A district court reviews de novo those portions of the report to which objection is made and may accept, reject,

CASE NO. 24-81129-CIV-CANNON/McCabe

or modify in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). To the extent a party fails to object to parts of the magistrate judge's report, the Court may accept the recommendation so long as there is no clear error on the face of the record. *Macort*, 208 F. App'x at 784.

DISCUSSION


The Report recommends that Plaintiff be awarded \$22,317.75 in attorneys' fees, an amount determined in the Report to be reasonable [ECF No. 24 pp. 5–7 (finding Plaintiff's proposed attorneys' fees for four attorneys on the case—which totaled to \$24,797.50—"well within the range of rates ordinarily charged in this community for legal services," but reducing that total number by 10% due to certain billing deficiencies like multiple timekeepers billing for the same task)]. No party objected to this conclusion, and the Court sees no clear basis to disturb it.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in the Report [ECF No. 26 pp. 1–8], it is **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** as follows:

1. The Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 26] is **ACCEPTED**.
2. Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Attorneys' Fees [ECF No. 24] is **GRANTED IN PART**.
3. Plaintiff is awarded attorneys' fees in the amount of **\$22,317.75** [ECF No. 26], to be paid by Defendant within **90 days** of this Order.

ORDERED in Chambers at Fort Pierce, Florida, this 20th day of January 2026.


AILEEN M. CANNON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

cc: counsel of record